



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,177	09/10/2003	Kengo Mori	17025	7477

23389 7590 12/13/2006

SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
SUITE 300
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER

FATAHIYAR, MAHMOUD

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2629

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/659,177

Applicant(s)

MORI ET AL.

Examiner

Mike Fatahiyar

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nolan et al(6,049,316).

Nolan et al disclose an image display system for realizing a multiple, monitor system, incorporating input and output interfaces(72, 74), a data sending, receiving and identification processing device(70) and a storage device(30, 64, 68) which all function as claimed.

In claims 2 and 11, relative to the limitations “DDC communication procedure” and “remotely controlling” such are also taught by Nolan et al(see figures 4, 6 and 8)

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nolan et al in view of Mitchell et al(5,987,614).

Nolan et al is discussed above. Mitchell et al is cited to show that the concept of utilizing manufacturer's serial number as a device address and identifying an operating

Art Unit: 2629

state of the image display devices in a distributed power management of a multidisplay system is old(see abstract; column 4, lines 1-37; column 7, lines 37-67 and column 9, lines 1-19). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Nolan et al with the noted teachings of Mitchell et al such that to utilize manufacturer's serial number as address of a display device and identifying its operating state because both references are related to distributed power management in an interconnected multiple display system.

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nolan et al in view of Tomohiro et al(JP-A-2001-356752).

Nolan et al is discussed above. Tomohiro et al is cited to show that the concept of extracting or reading out specification information from image display devices and extracting common data and editing its own specification in order to provide common output attribute is old(see the abstract). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Nolan et with the noted teachings of Tomohiro et al such that to extract common specification data among the display devices and modifying the specification data of the display devices such that to provide uniform attributes data among all the display devices because both references are related to a multiple display systems utilizing EDID information for making the monitors to display pictures properly.

6. Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nolan et al and Mitchell et al as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Tomohiro et al.

Art Unit: 2629

Nolan et al, Mitchell et al and Tomohiro et al are all discussed above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the above noted teachings of Tomohiro et al to the modified system of Ouch et al for the reasons outlined above in the paragraph 6.

7. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nolan et al in view of Jun et al(JP-A-2000-352962).

Nolan et al is discussed above. Jun et al is cited to show that the concept of adding index signals to the image signal and processing the indexes in a distributed multiple monitors system is old(see the abstract). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Nolan et al with the noted teaching of Jun et al because both references are related to controlling of multiple display monitors wherein the indexes could facilitate the addressing scheme of the monitors.

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nolan et al, Mitchell et al and Tomohiro et al as applied to claim12 above, and further in view of Jun et al.

All the above noted references are discussed above. Therefor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the above noted teachings of Jun et al to the modifies system of Nolan et al for the reasons outlined above in the paragraph 7.

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2629

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Fatahiyar whose telephone number is (571)272-7688. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600



M. Fatahiyar

December 12, 2006